## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ANTONIO CASTANEDA, Plaintiff(s),

Case No. 2:22-cv-01868-APG-NJK

## REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION<sup>1</sup>

[Docket No. 6]

J. TIMOTHY FATTIG, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis. Docket 13 No. 6.

Plaintiff's available funds exceed the full filing fee of \$402. Id. at 3. Therefore, Plaintiff does not qualify for *in forma pauperis* status and must pay the entire filing fee now. See id. (section 16 (2)(a) providing that the full filing fee is due if the current account balance is \$402 or more and that the full filing fee amount must be paid before the case proceeds); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) (a prisoner applying to proceed in forma pauperis must demonstrate "that the person is unable to pay such fees").2

20

19

2

3

4

6

7

8

9 v.

10

11

12

14

17

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

<sup>1</sup> The Ninth Circuit has held that denial of a request to proceed *in forma pauperis* is a matter beyond a magistrate judge's authority, Tripati v. Rison, 847 F.2d 548, 549 (9th Cir. 1988), so the undersigned issues this report and recommendation to the assigned district judge.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Even were Plaintiff to qualify to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the full filing fee would need to be paid in installments over time. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b).

Accordingly, the undersigned recommends that Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma* pauperis be **DENIED** and that Plaintiff be required to pay the full filing fee of \$402 before this case proceeds further.<sup>3</sup>

Dated: January 6, 2023

Nancy J. Koppe

United States Magistrate Judge

## **NOTICE**

This report and recommendation is submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party who objects to this report and recommendation must file a written objection supported by points and authorities within fourteen days of being served with this report and recommendation. Local Rule IB 3-2(a). Failure to file a timely objection may waive the right to appeal the district court's order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Nothing herein should be construed as indicating that Plaintiff's case can proceed on its merits once the filing fee has been paid. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (governing screening of prisoner complaints against government entities, officers, or employees). The undersigned will address screening at a later junction as appropriate.